

RESPONSE AND REMARKS

SECTION 103(a) REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, Claims 1-10 and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholls, (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,369; "Nicholls") in view of Kara, (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,568; "Kara") and further in view of InterShipper (Newsbytes Article, Internet Update). Office Action, Topic Nos. 2-5, pgs. 2-4.

RESPONSE REGARDING CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 103(a)

The Examiner's rejections of the Claims have been carefully considered. Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 15-21 have been amended to more distinctly claim the claimed invention.

For the reasons given further below¹, it is respectfully asserted that the amended Claims are distinguished from and patentable over the cited references.

THE CITED REFERENCES FAIL TO DISCLOSE GENERATING AN INTERACTIVE SIMULTANEOUS ONLINE DISPLAY COMPRISING SELECTABLE INDICATORS AS CLAIMED.

The Office Action cites InterShipper as disclosing "... display[ing] every method possible that you can use to ship your package for all major shippers" Office Action, Topic No. 5, p. 4.

As compared to merely listing methods for shipping, the amended Claims of the present application claim generating an interactive display that comprises selectable indicators for each delivery service for each carrier that would ship a parcel. For example, Claim 1 as amended claims "dynamically generate an interactive simultaneous online display comprising a selectable interactive representation of each said carrier-specific, delivery-service-specific shipping rate with a corresponding indication of said corresponding carrier-specific, delivery-service-specific scheduled delivery date." See *a/so*, e.g., amended independent Claims 2-3, 8-10 and 15-17 (claiming similar limitations).

¹ The Office Action makes various assertions in rejecting the pending claims and the Applicants have explicitly shown where certain features of the claims are not disclosed or suggested in the cited prior art. The Applicants, however, do not concede that the cited references disclose other features recited in the claims, and respectfully reserve the right to traverse any and all of the aspects of the rejections in greater detail at a later date.

That is, as compared to an information-only display, the amended Claims claim an interactive display comprising selectable indicators for each delivery service for each carrier that would ship a particular parcel.

It is respectfully asserted that the cited references fail to disclose the above-mentioned limitations of the amended Claims of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the amended Claims are distinguished from, and patentable over, the cited references and are therefore in condition for allowance.

THE CITED REFERENCES FAIL TO DISCLOSE GENERATING A DYNAMICALLY-DIMENSIONED INTERACTIVE SIMULTANEOUS ONLINE DISPLAY COMPRISING INTERACTIVE INDICATORS AS CLAIMED.

Further, as compared to merely listing methods for shipping in an information-only display, amended Claims 1, 2 and 10 of the present application claim generating a dynamically-dimensioned interactive display. For example, amended independent Claim 10 claims "... using the computer system for generating an interactive simultaneous online display dynamically dimensioned to only include an interactive indicator for each delivery service for each shipping carrier." See also, e.g., amended independent Claims 1 and 2 (claiming similar limitations).

It is respectfully asserted that the cited references fail to disclose the above-mentioned limitations of amended Claims 1, 2 and 10 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that amended Claims 1, 2 and 10 are distinguished from, and patentable over, the cited references and are therefore in condition for allowance.

THE CITED REFERENCES FAIL TO DISCLOSE GENERATING AN INTERACTIVE SIMULTANEOUS ONLINE DISPLAY COMPRISING SELECTABLE INDICATORS ADAPTED FOR CHARGING A USER ACCOUNT FOR A SHIPPING RATE AND PRINTING A SHIPPING LABEL AS CLAIMED.

Yet further, as compared to merely listing methods for shipping in an information-only display, amended independent Claim 9 claims selectable indicators adapted for charging a user account for a shipping rate corresponding to a particular delivery

service provided by a carrier associated with the indicator, and for printing a shipping label for shipping the parcel using the particular delivery service provided by the carrier. See also, e.g., amended independent Claim 17 (claiming similar limitations).

It is respectfully asserted that the cited references fail to disclose the above-mentioned limitations of amended Claims 9 and 17 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that amended Claims 9 and 17, and therefore their dependent Claims, are distinguished from, and patentable over, the cited references and are therefore in condition for allowance.

THE CITED REFERENCES FAIL TO DISCLOSE THE CLAIMED LIMITATIONS FOR RECEIVING DELIVERY ADDRESS INFORMATION FROM A BUYER, RECEIVING PARCEL SPECIFICATIONS FROM A SELLER, AND GENERATING AN INTERACTIVE SIMULTANEOUS ONLINE DISPLAY TO THE BUYER OF DELIVERY SERVICES OFFERED BY CARRIERS THAT WOULD SUPPORT SHIPPING A PARCEL FROM THE SELLER TO THE BUYER'S ADDRESS.

As amended, Claim 15 claims buyer input of the buyer's delivery address, and seller input of parcel specifications for a parcel for shipment from the seller to the buyer and then generating an interactive display to the buyer's computer of the available services and carriers that would ship the parcel from the seller to the buyer. See also, Claim 16 (claiming similar limitations).

It is respectfully asserted that exemplary embodiments of the amended limitations of Claims 15 and 16 would be helpful over the cited references in facilitating electronic-commerce-initiated shipment of a parcel between an online seller and an online buyer.

It is respectfully asserted that the cited references fail to disclose the above-mentioned limitations of amended Claims 15 and 16 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that amended Claims 15 and 16 are distinguished from, and patentable over, the cited references and are therefore in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the above-given reasons and in view of the herewith-made Claim amendments, it is respectfully asserted that the Claims of the present application are

not obvious in view of, and are therefore patentable over, Kara, Nicholls, and InterShipper, whether considered alone or in combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the present application is in condition for allowance and it is therefore respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By Marilyn R. Khorsandi August 29, 2011

Marilyn R. Khorsandi

Reg. No. 45,744

Customer No. 29524

Khorsandi Patent Law Group,
A Law Corporation

140 S. Lake Ave., Ste. 312

Pasadena, California 91101-4710

Telephone No.: (626) 796-2856

Fascimile: (626) 796-2864